

E 668

.C876

~~1875~~

68

876

~~1875~~

HON. S. S. COX

ON

FORCE OR FREEDOM.



"Be not prodigal or prodigious in revenge. Make not one in the *Historia horribilis*. Supererogate not in the worst sense, and overdo not the necessities of evil. Hinder not the injustice of revenge. Let thy arrows of revenge fly short, or be aimed like those of Jonathan, to fall beside the mark. If thou must needs have thy revenge of thine enemy, with a soft tongue break his bones, heap coals of fire on his head, forgive him, and enjoy it. Common *forcible* ways make not an end of evil, but leave hatred and malice behind them. If thou hast not mercy for others, yet be not cruel to thyself. 'Hath any wronged thee? Slight it, and the work's begun; forgive it, 'tis finished; he is below himself that is not above injury.' "

Sir Thomas Browne.

"We have conquered them with arms; we will now conquer them with magnanimity."

Abraham Lincoln.

PUNISHMENT OR PARDON; FORCE OR FREEDOM,
FOR THE WASTED LAND.

SPEECH
OF
HON. S. S. COX,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 27, 1875,

ON THE BILL (H. R. No. 4745)

TO PROVIDE AGAINST THE INVASION OF STATES, TO PREVENT THE
SUBVERSION OF THEIR AUTHORITY,

AND TO

MAINTAIN THE SECURITY OF ELECTIONS;

The sections of which provide penalties of fine and imprisonment, suspension
of *habeas corpus*, appointment of Federal Election-Supervisors
in the Congressional Districts, etc.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1875.

S P E E C H
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. COX.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 4745) to provide against the invasion of States, to prevent the subversion of their authority, and to maintain the security of elections; the sections of which provide penalties of fine and imprisonment, suspension of *habeas corpus*, appointment of Federal election supervisors in the Congressional districts, &c.—

Mr. COX said :

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COBURN] most cordially for the privilege of speaking in his time.

It is with great embarrassment that I rise now to speak on this topic. Observing old friends who have served with me in other days of trial, when kindred themes stirred us to debate, (referring to Hon. George H. Pendleton, Hon. Mr. Boccocke of Virginia, and others, who sat near,) and surrounded as I am by a score of members of the next Congress, I feel like one standing on an isthmus between two seas; and the solemnity which comes with the shadow of memory is clouded by the portents of our future. If such bills as this are to pass, what is to be our condition ?

FORCE OR AMNESTY.

Expressed, not by its title, but by the name it has assumed among the people, it is a force bill. The best way to antagonize it is by substituting kindness and justice. Hence my notice of an amendment to replace its rigorous provisions of hate and coercion by a bill for general and generous amnesty.

I had the honor to introduce one among the first bills for amnesty here; and it came within two votes of passing. That was as early as 1860. Since then this House in moments of unimpassioned patriotism has indicated its preference in the same direction. The gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BUTLER,] in December, 1870, introduced his bill "for full and general grace, amnesty, and oblivion." It was mainly copied from an old English statute about the Scotch rebellion. I could not then help but characterize his bill for pains and penalties as a meager system of mercy. It was characterized as grace which was grudging, amnesty which was exceptional, and oblivion full of memories. It was ungracious grace and punitive pardon. It was a rushing and turbulent Lethe. I plead for mercy on the eternal plan: no eternizing of persecution; no probing of the old wounds. That bill had in it what is omitted here, oblivion for the agents and officers on the United States engaged in reconstruction. I miss that here.

No one here and now offers to pardon the Kelloggs, Durells, Packards, Sheridans, and others engaged in fettering the State of Louisiana.

But, sir, what more can be said of the unwisdom of further repression by the Federal janissaries and oppression by the ductile Federal usurpers? What more can be said against the suspension of the writ of liberty? What now is its object? Who dare allege a state of affairs, south or north, which requires such suspension? The Constitution (article 1, section 9) wisely prohibits such suspension, "unless in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it." Who seriously pretends that there is any more "rebellion" in the legal and adjudged sense, than there is "invasion" from within or abroad? This suspension of the great writ is the part of a plan hereafter to be dissected, which provokes to violence, with a view to fresh election complications.

HISTORIC LESSONS ON GRACE.

Can we not learn from history? Must we again cite instances for civil guidance? Must we go to Montesquieu to show that the business of statesmanship is not to destroy the rebel, but the rebellion; or to Ossian for the metaphor of many streams against the enemy, but as a zephyr that moves the grass to the vanquished? Have the lessons of Roman history, drawn from Cicero—to fortify the Republic with acts of kindness—no application to our condition? Is there nothing in the refinement of the tournament which lifted up the knight of the lowered lance? Is the history of England, in its relations toward Wales, America, Scotland, Ireland, nothing to us for precept and example? Are the Hebraic, Grecian, Christian teachings—the bloom and fragrance of all civilized polity—nothing? As summed up by a quaint English writer—whose thought I have adopted for my title page—the very genius of good government—after rebellion, or before to avert it—resides in the compact of concord. Why cannot we write our wrongs in ashes; draw the curtain over injuries? Forgiveness is not forgiveness—if we only pray God to forgive our enemy and we do not ourselves pardon. We must forgive without reserve; forgive wholly, as we hope for forgiveness.

All bills framed in any other spirit will fail as all your coercive bills have failed for conciliation. You cannot sow this land with dragon's teeth and expect other than a harvest of armed disasters.

THE POINTS OF BAD POLICY—DISCONTENT.

Whatever, therefore, Mr. Speaker, may be the outrages south, and whoever is responsible, the large and dominating fact remains, that tranquillity is absent. Its lack is the evidence and sign of bad rule. Grapes are not of thorns, nor figs of thistles. It is the good tree that bringeth forth good fruit. Let us test these acts of reconstruction and force by their fruits. Unless we do so, our remedies will be inadequate, and the more bitter the future fruitage.

MORAL TREASON AND SOCIAL ANARCHY.

I speak to-day as I have often spoken before in this House, against measures fraught with such consequences, and therefore I speak against moral treason and social anarchy. My remarks are not made to grace the utterance and fervor of an hour, to vibrate for a moment in angry debate; they have been pondered and repondered in the quietude of my room, so that no sophistical reasoning should escape my own criticism. There is no merit, no intrepidity on my part, in challenging the wisdom or the results of that repressive and distrustful policy which has made chaos instead of order in the Southern States since the war.

RECONSTRUCTION AND ITS RESULTS.

At the beginning of the reconstruction measures upon the bill introduced by Henry Winter Davis in 1864, to reform Tennessee on the plan of one-tenth rule of her people, I opposed with all the vehemence and illustration within my reach the rickety plan of commencing to build at the roof and not at the foundation. The reconstruction measures which followed the close of the war have undergone the tests of time and experience; that they are vitally deficient, that they have been worse administered, all will agree who look below the superficies of our social and political order. They have failed in the object of government, peace, security, nationality, and patriotism.

HISTORY OF RECONSTRUCTION—COERCION.

The history of reconstruction is a painful one—"infandum dolorem." From the beginning of President Johnson's proclamation on the 9th of May, 1865, as to Virginia, and continuing down through the contest with Congress and by the veto, one idea seemed prominent with the Executive and his able cabinet—amnesty. It was partial and limited at first; but it exacted as a compensation certain concessions, which were promptly made by the States. President Johnson did not, however, coerce the States into determining any policy as to suffrage. The platforms of the dominant party denied to those lately in rebellion any participation in reforming the States. They had forfeited, it was said, their right by treason. President Johnson was derided; his policy scorned; his mild methods contemned; and in the finale he barely escaped losing his own high office through the malice of those who were hunting down the South. His touch-stone to bring patriotism to the test, pardon, he favored no bayonet rule, and his general-in-chief, Grant, was his adviser in this noble policy. Then came the Thirty-ninth Congress with its presiding genius, Thaddeus Stevens; and with it and with him fell the hopes of all; for that Congress began the work which, built with untempered mortar, is already tumbling about us. To rescue it or to remove it is the duty of coming Congresses. Following the Freedmen's Bureau and the civil-rights bills, disqualifying measures and military districts, dictations to States and enabling acts for representation, came supplemental bills, until what with vetoes and soldiers, and registers of votes and crude constitutions, there sprung full armed the model "omnibus bill" for the admission of certain States on certain conditions. These measures were the forerunners of the two bills this session which have drawn so much attention from the public and which have required all the vigilance, mental and physical, of the minority here to postpone and defeat. Each and all are samples of the utter failure of the coercive principle; and the present bill is but a copy of its antitypes, founded on the idea that suffrage is in danger; that the black suffragans are weak and are easily intimidated; and that as republicans are entitled to the votes of the Africans *willy nilly*, so all the processes for prosecution, fine, and imprisonment, and all the modes to supervise, spy out, and influence the voter and the ballot-box, even to the use of military force, ought to be used. What for? To continue republican partisan ascendancy, though it imperil every State in the Republic.

It is this policy which the democracy and its liberal allies boldly confront. It is this policy which it was the object of the late popular expression to condemn.

I propose to-day to discuss the present situation not merely in view of the recent elections, which have an inner meaning with respect

to this subject, but with a view to show wherein the objects of good government have been frustrated, and if possible to evoke a remedy commensurate with these extensive and momentous mischiefs. First, waiving for the present any allusion to the complex nature of our Federal and local governments, not forgetting that we have one supreme government as to certain affairs, and not necessarily one in all things, let me test by recent events the wisdom of our post-war policy. No one will dispute as to certain objects of civil government, and, whether written or unwritten, that these objects are designed to protect personal liberty and honest property. It is the province of government to throw its force against the strong hand of individual violence and in favor of the gentle methods of judicial arbitration, and we are not the less bound to save the system on which we are ingrafted from any external power which would injure. By the same right whereby we protect men of all religions in their conscientious convictions, government should protect men of all classes against rapine and spoliation. Government should assure the man who sows, the privilege of reaping. His harvest is his to use as he pleases, subject only to those exactions which are indispensable to the maintenance of the government which protects his industry. What a satire on these organic principles is the recent misgovernment in the South, I will presently determine. The question is not as to whether the State or the Federal Government is responsible, or which is most responsible. The fact remains that in the effort to restore States, to rebuild their dismantled social order—contentment, the object of all government, has been wanting. Military compression and civil oppression have made large bodies of men reckless of the old divisions of power.

DESPERATION SOUTH.

Men in their desperation, who once had just and elevated views of our polity, have cried out sometimes for imperial power, sometimes for military rule, and sometimes for revolution. Civil convulsions, sometimes marked with blood, and sometimes taking the form of race conflict, have accompanied this discontent. It is no longer a question of political union so much, for all discontented men South have been willing to be pinned to the Union even by an honest bayonet, or held to it by a mailed hand, or shackled to it by an iron gyve. Nor will it be doubted that throughout this decade of discontent and convulsion there has been an aspiration for civil discipline and patriotic allegiance. This has been chilled by our conduct on its every demonstration. And yet without this aspiration no State can be permanent. When that protection, which is the consideration and correlative of allegiance, fails so signally and constantly, all history teaches that then the bond of allegiance becomes thin and weak, society declines, and tyranny supervenes. It may be a question whether in such a condition foreign conquest may not be a blessing. I assert that underlying all the trials and troubles, frauds and oppressions, whether by judicial decree or military proclamation, this is the capital crime of the party just retiring from power.

ALLEGIANCE AND PROTECTION.

A French philosopher has said that "in all forms of government the feeling of allegiance or loyalty is the condition of contentment." There must be in the constitution of the state something which is settled—unquestionably permanent—which cannot be dispensed with, secure against all vicissitude and change. This is the sacred something in our system of Federal and State governments which is above discussion, and which is founded upon the sovereign will of the

people. That sacred something is found not merely in the Federal Constitution, but in all those rights reserved and all those powers ungranted which belong to State or local administration. Break this mystic union of Federal and State systems, allow the one to encroach upon the other, and you lose the sacramental essence, the divine appointment which inspires loyalty and gives hope and courage and honor to labor, liberty, property, and life. Nations, ancient and modern, have risen or fallen according as they have comprehended or violated this fundamental law.

It is not my purpose to review the causes which produced, or the circumstances which justified the civil war, either from one standpoint or another. When at Appomattox Court-House the bugles sounded the great truce it was hoped that the conditions of peace, tranquil government, and a contented people would be observed; that all future griefs would be solaced; that magnanimity would conquer angry hatred, scorn, and revenge, and that for many uncounted decades there would be no interregnum in the serene dynasty of peace and love; that through the bleeding and bloody land, and over the scenes of death and the sorrows of mourning, the lethean wave would flow. We have had the lethean wave, but the only repose has been that of despair and death. It was all Lethe except its sleep; it was all death without its repose. Homes have been wasted, property confiscated and destroyed, enterprises ruined, cities burned, a whole country swathed in destruction. We had hoped amid these immeasurable calamities that the hates and griefs would not be perpetuated; that the new generation should not wear the rancor in their hearts till their hair had whitened for the tomb; that they would not teach their children to perpetuate the hate of their fathers.

TEN YEARS OF MOCKERY.

For ten long years all these hopes have been mocked; and what a mockery! God has fixed his creatures in this fair land in habitations bound together by the same rivers, mountains, lakes, and skies. He has fixed in their hearts the ennobling principles of peace. He has sent to this star the very Prince of Peace, as an exemplar and Saviour, and yet these benefactions are turned by the passions and ambitions of men into shameful mockery.

We had good right to believe that the truce would have been kept. We must not forget the record made by General Grant himself shortly after the war.

GENERAL GRANT'S TESTIMONY IN 1865 AS TO SOUTHERN SENTIMENT AND CONTENT.

In the midst of the deep wrath which the outrageous Louisiana usurpation has roused and the various arguments employed to defend as well as denounce it, one simple connection of circumstances seems to have been entirely overlooked. Logically considered, it indicates that the President's views have undergone an alarming modification, since he was made President, in the interest of perpetuating himself in his office or certainly in that of Federal military interference in political affairs.

The inconsistency as revealed by his own official papers is so gross that no explanation can be made without attributing motives of dangerous ambition. I do not refer to his portentous change of opinion as to Arkansas since the session began, but to his wide departure from his own just observations of 1865.

General Grant in his official report to the President of his southern State inspection, under date December 18, 1865, writes:

I am satisfied the thinking men of the South accept the present situation of affairs

in good faith. . . * There is such universal acquiescence in the authority of the General Government throughout the portions of the country visited by me, that the mere presence of a military force without regard to numbers is sufficient to maintain order.

If such was the condition of the South, and especially of New Orleans, where General Grant made his longest stay during his tour of inspection in 1865, what must have been the maladministration there since to produce a revulsion of sentiment which seems to call for the present repressive course? Who is responsible for it? The President and his friends have had a free rein, and the result according to their own showing is a condition of present anarchy in contrast with that he reported nine years previous.

The following extracts from an official letter to the President by General Grant, under date October 24, 1866, indicate the views of the latter relative to the employment of troops in political contests.

The letter is the most statesmanlike I have read from General Grant, as the following extracts may show :

The conviction is forced on my mind that no reason now exists for giving or promising the military aid of the Government to support the laws of Maryland. The tendency of giving such aid or promise would be to produce the very result intended to be averted. So far there seems to be merely a very bitter contest for political ascendancy in the State.

Military interference would be interpreted as giving aid to one of the factions, no matter how pure the intentions or how guarded or just the instructions.

It is a contingency I hope never to see arise in this country while I occupy the position of General-in-Chief of the Army, to have to send troops to a State in full relations with the General Government on the eve of an election to preserve the peace. If insurrection does come, the law provides the method of calling out the forces to suppress it.

How are General Grant's opinions of the condition of the Southern States, including Louisiana, and his views of the impropriety of employing the military forces of the Government in politics, reconcilable with his late acts, except upon the hypothesis that he ignores fact and patriotism for some ambitions end?

If our countrymen patiently abide this usurpation, a great barrier to empire will have been destroyed, and the third term and future terms be at the behest of one whose views, under the exercise of power, have sustained the change I have represented. I hope the issue may not be confused.

MR. LINCOLN'S POLICY.

It will not be denied that ten years ago, when reconstruction was first broached, there were men or fiends who talked utter extermination. Mr. Lincoln did not share this execrable spirit. He proposed to reach the South by friendly means; with him charity predominated; in his death the South was crucified. His policy, as indicated in his messages and in the dispatches of Mr. Seward, would at once have filled the vacant seats of southern members without convulsion and without discontent; and whatever changes had taken place under the new order created by the war, they would have accorded easily, naturally, and in the interest of harmony and peace. And the colored race, to-day lying despoiled, stricken, and cast off, even from the paternal Government, would have been elevated, cared for, and their labor made more remunerative under better conditions of freedom and independence. Mr. Lincoln had not read history in vain. It was an open book to him; and what did it not reveal? The pitiless destruction of the Moors of Andalusia by the second Philip, the merciless slaughter of the French in La Vendée, the sanguinary pursuit of Claverhouse after the Scottish covenanter, the stained and cadaverous cheek of Ireland, the maddening history of Poland, the history of all subjected

and despoiled provinces and countries, and, sir, the terrible reaction upon those who despoiled and subjected them. In the place of the Lincoln policy of charity and peace, ay, even in the place of sudden calamities, radical reconstruction has given us prolonged torture. The fruits of that policy are not seen in the strength, stability, grandeur or progress of our nation, nor in the condition of our business and our labor, of our commerce and our credit. They are seen in the wasting of revenues, or in fact the non-collection of revenue through impoverishment.

SPOLIATION OF THE SOUTH.

The Mississippi is still ours to the Gulf, but where is its commerce? Charleston looks out upon Sumter, and Sumter has nothing to protect. The sea islands no longer echo to the music, the exultation and hope of an industrious people. There is only heard there the discourse of mangy politicians of all grades of degradation, worshipping their radical feticch. Some of these States were happily rescued before being thoroughly impoverished—Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia. They received an infusion of new life, because the weapon with which they were struck was not entirely lethal. Beneath this rule of men entirely bad, whose consciousness course had much to do with their maladministration, there was a vicious heresy. It was the fountain of bitter and poisonous waters. That heresy held that certain States had sacrificed their corporate existence; it held that they were no longer component members of the Union; it contradicted the declared object and principle of the war. It transferred the right to govern them to a Congress which was not omnipotent. Hence, when reconstruction began through Congress, it assumed that an oligarchy of one-tenth should reform the States. Hence disqualifying amendments, and odious conditions; hence agents to govern who were not selected by the people of the States; hence a large field was opened for executive bashaws and adventurous rascals; and hence by a natural sequence the source of power which should have been in the States was fixed at the Federal capital. And wherein does such a government differ from the rankest orientalism? Conquered provinces and oligarchical States, in place of the constituted local State governments, are both a solecism and a weakness. Such a condition could not give content. It put in jeopardy the liberties and governments of the people North; it became an image, part brass and part clay; and the intolerable oppression upon one-half of the country became a burden and a reproach to the other.

PATERNAL GOVERNMENT.

It was not in the nature of things in this country, it was not in accordance with our traditions or our organic laws, that the duties of the Federal Government should be paternal. It was not possible in nature for a government to love its subjects as a father his children. Show me the government, or the agents of a government, distinct and irresponsible as the Federal Government is from the States, which for purposes of honest and wise rule is as superior in intelligence to its people as a father is to his child. Such a paternal affection is as irrational and certainly more dangerous than the figment of the constitution which Locke made for North Carolina, or which Plato made for his imaginary commonwealth. This congressional reconstructive paternity, with its new-born Bureaus, undertook to fill the platonic idea by occupying in the moral the place of "the all"—*το πᾶν*. Macaulay satirizes this utopian danger when he says: "Why should not Government take away the child from the mother, select

the nurse, regulate the school, overlook the play-ground, prescribe what parodies shall be sung, what tune shall be played, what books shall be read, what physic shall be swallowed? Why should it not choose our wives, limit our expenses, stint us to a certain number of dishes of meat, of glasses of wine, and of cups of tea?" What with agricultural, educational, freedmen's, and other Bureaus, and added to them this Federal supervision over elections, with flagellating penalties and the paramount rule of the military in this bill, if we do not have a paternal government, then no such government is possible. To ascertain the value of such paternal care, it may be well to go into the figures of arithmetic, which are more emphatic on such questions than figures of rhetoric.

DEBTS AND LIABILITIES SOUTH.

I do not now refer to the direct losses, estimated at seven billions, which the war occasioned, nor the incalculable indirect consequences in the losses of enterprises and industries; but I refer just now to the debts and liabilities of these Southern States since the war, as developed by the Ku-Klux report of 1872, a succinct statement of which is as follows:

Alabama.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$5,939,654.87; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$38,381,967.37.

Arkansas.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$4,036,952.87; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$19,761,265.62.

Florida.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$221,000; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$15,763,447.54.

Georgia.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, nominal; debts and liabilities June, 1871, \$50,137,500. (See statement of Mr. Augier, treasurer of Georgia.)

Louisiana.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$10,009,074.34; debts and liabilities June 1, 1871, including the excess of expenditures over receipts, \$50,540,206.91.

North Carolina.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$9,699,500; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$34,887,467.85.

South Carolina.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$5,000,000; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$39,158,914.47.

Mississippi.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, nominal; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, about \$2,000,000.

Tennessee.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$20,105,606.66; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$45,688,263.46.

Texas.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, nominal; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$20,361,000.

Virginia.—Debts and liabilities at the close of the war, \$31,938,144.59; debts and liabilities January 1, 1872, \$45,480,542.21.

In this list Louisiana is stated under the truth. We are advised that at this time the debt is \$65,000,000, the interest \$4,000,000, while \$5,000,000 more is to be added for the expenses of a State administration not the product of a legal election. This goes on and will go on under the ambiguous pusillanimity of Congress; for does not Congress by its non-action authorize the President to prop Kellogg's power by the bayonet? Does not Congress, in its Punic faith, allow Louisiana to be bound in withes, that it may be more readily plundered? Where and when is there to be any relief?

MATERIAL LOSSES BY RECONSTRUCTION POLICIES.

Would you know further how this paternal reconstruction and its bad policies have affected material interests South? Let me call your attention to some statistics to illustrate the nature and effect of these bayonet and bureau governments. In Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas the illustration is peculiarly significant. On all the cereals, cotton, tobacco, live stock, farms, personal estates, wool, peas and beans, potatoes, and butter, the in-

crease from 1850 to 1860 is in sad contrast with the decrease from 1860 to 1870, under the policy of hate and spoliation. The tables will show the percentage of decrease. They will also show what would have been the prosperity of these States under orderly rule. The loss on tobacco is seventy-five millions, on cereals one hundred millions, on cotton four hundred millions, on stock four hundred and eighty millions, and on farms four thousand millions. But to the table:

Productions in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas.

Products.	1850.	1860.	1870.
Cereals.....	\$316,344,306	\$339,960,320	\$236,069,148
Cotton.....	2,432,321	5,333,867	3,008,033
Tobacco.....	90,965,429	203,142,103	73,113,048
Value of live stock.....	191,327,756	381,778,601	280,284,912
Value of farms.....	793,342,168	2,012,708,493	1,088,746,888
Value of personal property.....		2,478,844,459	612,075,308
Acres improved.....	42,684,965	56,833,154	49,567,628
Wool.....	8,337,523	9,867,268	7,976,984
Peas and beans.....	7,374,700	11,501,963	2,305,984
Potatoes.....	39,846,301	44,584,504	23,236,788
Butter.....	34,606,394	59,642,527	44,571,545

Percentage of increase from 1850 to 1860 and decrease from 1860 to 1870.

Products.	Increase, 1850 to 1860.	Decrease, 1860 to 1870.
Cereals.....	7½	41
Cotton.....	119	43½
Tobacco.....	123	64
Value of live stock.....	99½	26½
Acresage.....	33	12
Wool.....	18	19
Peas and beans.....	56	79
Potatoes.....	11	47
Butter.....	72	25

Had the wealth of these States increased from 1860 to 1870 as it did from 1850 to 1860, there would have been in 1870—

Cereals.....	\$364,890,743 instead of	\$236,069,148
Cotton.....	11,681,168 instead of	3,008,033
Tobacco.....	453,006,889 instead of	73,113,048
Value of stock.....	761,648,308 instead of	280,284,912
Value of farms.....	5,192,152,487 instead of	1,088,746,888
Acres improved.....	75,588,094 instead of	49,567,628

The value of all farm productions in 1870 was \$633,236,435. That of 1860 is not given in the census of 1860, but the quantities are and the crop, comparing quantities shows a loss as compared with those of 1860 of 45 per cent. If the values of the productions by given quantities are the same, the crop of 1860 was \$918,192,829, and that is greater than the crop of 1870 by \$284,956,394. What a commentary is here on such policies as this bill intrudes upon the country!

Now, if we compare the crop of 1860 with what the crop of 1870

ought to have been by increase of population and labor, we find that it fell over four hundred millions below what it ought to have been. Who is responsible for these losses? Ah! but it may be said, "this is the consequence of the war that ended in 1865." Let us see if it is so. How are we to account for the fact that in 1859 these States raised 282,626,000 bushels of corn, and in 1873, fourteen years afterward, and eight years after the war, with a million additional population, they only raised 217,741,000 bushels. How is it that they raised 31,441,826 bushels of wheat in 1859 and only 24,574,000 in 1873? How is it that Louisiana in 1859 raised 230,982 hogsheads of sugar and in 1873 89,498? What do these figures mean *since* the war: 1870 144,881; 1871, 128,461; 1872, 108,520; 1873, 89,498. Do they not mean reconstruction; that the blight did not exhaust itself at the end of the war, but points its skeleton hand to a lower deep yet to be touched by a wretched and distracted people? If bills like these are to pass to harass and vex industries and people, who can tell the lowest depth of that deep with which the South is threatened? As the aggregate of these Southern States shows a falling off in acreage, it may be thought this depression in agriculture arose from the farms destroyed by the armies in the field during the war. To show that this is error, we will take the State of Texas, to whose distinguished representative [Mr. MILLS] I am greatly indebted for these economic observations.

Texas is by far the most prosperous of all the Southern States; because there was no Federal army during the war, and no destruction of farms by armies. Besides there is an increased acreage by reason of the heavy immigration of whites since the war. We find, however, the same melancholy prostration of farming interests, as follows:

Losses in Texas.

	1860.	1870.
Aeres improved.....	\$2, 650, 781	\$2, 964, 836
Value of farms.....	88, 101, 320	60, 149, 950
Farm implements.....	6, 250, 452	3, 396, 793
Value of animals slaughtered.....	5, 143, 635	4, 835, 284
Value of all live stock.....	42, 825, 447	37, 425, 194
Horses.....	325, 698	424, 504
Mules, &c.....	63, 334	61, 132
Milch cows.....	601, 540	428, 048
Oxen.....	172, 492	132, 407
Other cattle.....	2, 761, 736	2, 933, 588
Sheep.....	753, 363	704, 351
Swine.....	1, 371, 532	1, 202, 445
Wheat.....	1, 478, 345	415, 112
Rye.....	111, 860	28, 521
Corn.....	16, 500, 702	20, 554, 538
Oats.....	985, 889	702, 663
Barley.....	67, 562	44, 351
Buckwheat.....	1, 349	44
Rice.....	26, 031	63, 844
Tobacco.....	97, 914	59, 706
Cotton.....	431, 463	350, 628
Wool.....	1, 493, 738	1, 251, 328
Peas and beans.....	341, 961	42, 654
Potatoes.....	2, 020, 794	2, 396, 424
Wine.....	14, 199	6, 216
Butter.....	5, 850, 583	3, 712, 747
Cheese.....	275, 128	34, 342
Sugar.....	5, 009	2, 020
Molasses.....	520, 770	420, 571
Honey.....	594, 273	275, 169

NATIONAL WEALTH IN ALL THE STATES AND ITS DECREASE UNDER RECONSTRUCTION.

1850.....	\$7, 135, 600, 800
1860.....	16, 159, 616, 668
1870.....	26, 967, 281, 172

Increase in wealth from 1850 to 1860, 1.28 per cent.

Increase in wealth from 1860 to 1870, 68 per cent.

The material wealth of 1870 is reduced to gold at 111½, the premium on gold 30th of June, 1870, to make comparison with the gold value of 1850 and 1860.

The same remark applies to the next succeeding table on agriculture.

The censuses of 1850 and 1860 do not, like 1870, give the *value* of all farm productions, but they do give the *quantities*. Mr. Grosvenor, in his work on political economy published in 1868, says the value of all farm productions in 1860 was about \$2,600,000,000, and that it increased 100 per cent. from 1850 to 1860. By looking at the quantities produced, as shown in the census, he is fully sustained in his estimate.

Then we have in 1860, 163,110,720 acres in cultivation; in 1870, 188,921,099 acres.

From my best information, I estimate that it will cost \$10 per acre on an average of crops to cultivate them; but if this is not correct as an estimate, it will not affect the result, as it will be applied to both periods and will affect them equally:

	1860.	1870.
Cash value of farms and farming implements.....	\$6,891,263,148	\$8,509,580,529
Cash value of productions on estimate of Grosvenor.....	2,600,000,000	2,195,101,935
Cost of production at \$10 per acre.....	1,631,107,200	1,889,210,990
Net profit.....	968,892,700	305,890,945

Loss on productions of 1870 as compared with 1860, \$404,898,065.

Net profit in 1860, 14 per cent.

Net profit in 1870, 3½ per cent.

But we see from the tables in the census that the productions increased 100 per cent. from 1850 to 1860. If nothing had retarded the prosperity of our agriculture, it would have continued to increase at the same ratio of 100 per cent.; then the production of 1870 ought to have been 100 per cent. over 1860, or \$5,200,000,000; but it was only, \$2,195,100,935, showing a loss of \$3,004,898,065. Notwithstanding there were over twenty-five million more acres in cultivation and over sixteen hundred millions more money invested in farms and farming implements and seven millions more people, the crop is over four hundred millions below the crop of 1860. Who is responsible?

To illustrate the growth from 1850 to 1860, I present the following statements:

Products.	1850.	1860.	1870.
Cotton.....	\$2,469,093	\$5,387,052	\$3,011,996
Corn.....	592,074,194	838,792,742	760,944,549
Tobacco.....	199,752,655	434,209,461	262,735,311
Wheat.....	100,485,944	173,194,924	287,745,626

The census tables show an increase from 1850 to 1860 and decrease from 1860 to 1870:

Products.	Increase, 1850 to 1860.	Decreased, 1860 to 1870.
Cotton.....	118	44
Tobacco.....	117	39
Buckwheat.....	96	44
Rye.....	48	19
Peas and beans.....	64	61
Mules, &c.....	105	2
Oxen.....	32	41
Hogs.....	10	25
Cattle.....	52	8

Wheat showed an increase at both periods, but 6 per cent. greater at 1860 than 1870.

These facts from the census serve to illustrate the general ideas which apply to the underlying principle, or rather lack of principle, upon which reconstruction was based. The principle necessarily involved perfidious and bad agencies to realize it, and consequently losses of property, direct, consequential, and otherwise.

VAGABOND AGENCIES SOUTH.

Perhaps the crying sin of these agencies was their vagabond qualities. The great body of the men who undertook to carry out this reconstruction were vagrant peripatetics, having no fixed and abiding interest in the place where they sat down. They generally had two thoughts: first, to make all they could, and, second, to move off with what they had made. The right of locomotion without passports or hinderance is one of the most sacred rights which any free government can give. I applaud the proper and beneficent offices of immigration, but I denounce its counterfeit and abuse. Immigration is a part of the history of the last few centuries. All our people had ancestors who were scattered from the Rhine to the Lifey, from the Danube to the Thames. There is a utility and a beauty in this exodus from the Old World to the New. The value and grandeur such immense movements mean to this new hemisphere all appreciate, and but for this movement from 1790 till to-day we would have but ten millions of people in our land at the present moment. No one objects to this movement, for it brings hundreds of millions of values as well in gold and silver as in industry, mind, and muscle.

UTILITY OF INTERSTATE RELATIONS.

But if any portion of such a movement came to overturn our attractive system of government, to change the form and the substance of our polity, we would at once cease to be attractive. We should at once close our gates to the exodus. Between our States this exodus is double that of any other country. Our *Magna Charta* gives us the right of free egress and regress. That right, like our writ of *habeas corpus*, has contributed to our advancement. Even trees and plants improve by transplanting, but the transplanting should be rightly done. It should be suited to the soil and protected against winter frosts and adverse winds. We have the same right to go and come as to post our letters or otherwise commune with our friends.

When, therefore, adventurous rascality travels only to despoil, and denunciation falls upon it, the denunciation is in favor of that rightful and healthy movement by which States are peopled, elevated, and energized.

When the reconstruction measures began to be organized under such bad agencies, the very lethargy and devastation of the South attracted not merely good citizens who would build up, but a horde of the bad who would tear down. All desirable populations were welcomed at the South: they deserved and received encouragement. They were not the jackalls to the lions of war, or hyenas among the graves of the dead. No man in Georgia objected to an artisan going there to help manufacture cotton: no man in Louisiana complained if a stranger rescued a wasted sugar plantation from the alligator: no man in Texas complained of the German who went there to raise cereals, cotton, or cattle. The complaint and the grievance begins when the myrmidons of political power, the mercenaries and the suttlers, the bureaucrats and adventurers, who have no local habitation or name, make alliance with illiteracy, fan race prejudices, despoil railroads, and revel in inordinate taxations. These men not only discredited the bonds of their States in the markets, upon the exchange, but dislocated by their devices the industries of the South.

THE DISFRANCHISED—THE SUPERIOR RACE.

Having no part in the honors and offices that belong to self-government, the best men were powerless before such an alliance. These adventurers were the cuckoos who sat upon the eggs of other birds—the scum which rose to the top of political reconstruction. They were called carpet-baggers, not because they always carried one of those indispensable articles of travel, for many of them were not even provided with that article, but they moved in a mysterious way, with no fixed mode of life or the *animus manendi*. The carpet-bagger had little to go on and much to get. He made out of negro credulity a living, and he made the negro his prey. He began as a sharper and was reconstructed as a statesman. He had a bayonet within call, and even before the happy days of "overflowed bacon," he had rations in abundance. He not only registered votes at pleasure, but became an organic law-maker and a legislator. The less he had at stake, the more he had of taxes. The county and State offices at first filled his ambition: then he aspired, when plethoric with funds, to be Congressman, Senator, and governor. He waxed fat and kicked. He kicked the negro, and by a beautiful law of nature the negro is just now beginning to return the compliment. His chief occupation has been to count votes that were never cast, and count out wages which were never earned, and to make all who despise him appear as unrepentant rebels. How could reconstruction stand on such loose material?

OTHER GRIEVANCES.

One of the great grievances of our fathers was the creation of a multitude of new offices and a swarm of officers from abroad to harass the people and eat of their substance. Our fathers complained of the establishment of a foreign jurisdiction. The quartering of armed troops completed the work of desolation and tyranny. Every one of these complaints find their counterpart in the gospel of anarchy preached through bills like the present one, and in the moral treason which inspires their enactment.

"REGULATE" ELECTIONS.

A part of this programme of anarchy and tyranny is the power granted in this bill to petty Federal officers over elections. Have we

not had enough of these sickening examples? Let us have done with a set of men who can postpone "regular" elections or "correct" their returns, just as it best suits the purpose of the master, who with an unlimited executive police at his elbow, with unlimited powers, can levy taxes to pay them, collect taxes not authorized, declare martial law, suspend the *habeas corpus*, erect military commissions, try his subjects, and hang them—by your authority and in consequence of your enactment!

This is all your own work, gentlemen of the majority! You want to repeat it for 1876, do you? The very first act of congressional usurpation was the prelude to all the drama, the key-note to the whole of this infernal chorus. When it became possible to do one thing outside or above the Constitution, it became necessary to order all your actions on that plane. Every line must needs be longer than a straight line, and no action of yours outside the Constitution could fail to breed evil and prepare the way for misery.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Am I asked whether these thoughts lead toward the repeal of the amendments of the Constitution which grew out of the war and its conditions? I answer, that these amendments, if rightly construed, as they have been by the United States Supreme Court, are only intended to deny powers to the States and not to grant or enlarge the Federal powers. Under them the opposite party claim to do everything. We do not ask to undo the past, nor the work of the war. We take the country where the war left it and its situation now. The Constitution remains to us, and its amendments remain; but they furnish no authority for such bills as the present one. It is in the administration and legislation under the amendments that we find the usurper and the reconstructor who are dangerous to peace and the fomenters of anarchy. When we read in our authentic reports from both sides what has been done in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana, we can readily perceive the drift of this arraignment of bad government.

NO RETROGRESSION.

Neither am I to be placed, as the gentleman from Ohio [MR. GARFIELD] intimated the other day, in antagonism to the colored race. I disclaimed being responsible for Judge Van Trump's *dictum* in the minority Ku-Klux report. It is not a fair inference that I favored the abolition of colored suffrage and the oppression of the African. That protest was meant, so far as I know, to apply to the irrepressible social conflict between black and white, which is urged by party tricksters to keep the colored voters with the radicals.

I have already said here that New York State, on motion of a democratic Senator, anticipated action here, under the thirteenth amendment, by removing the property qualifications upon negro suffrage in New York. The Cincinnati and Baltimore platforms meant no reaction on this subject of enlarged suffrage. No one on any committee could or can reverse the action of our State and national conventions, which accepted, with Horace Greeley, the situation. Honest men then united to forget the past and advance the democratic party to its present condition. To-day they are more sincere in caring for the real interests of the lowly and colored than those who use them to their hurt and to the distress, impoverishment, and dishonor of southern people and State governments. The negroes will find out their friends. The democracy accepts the present condition of affairs in order to better them. It does not propose any retrogression.

The relations of slavery, the questions of civil war, the grief and grievances of that vast conflict, are or should be buried. Out of their graves spring new conditions and fresh responsibilities. The foremost duty is the satisfaction of the people in the new order, and the replacement of those guarantees of public security North and South, without which government, like that in Louisiana, is little less than anarchy. The party in power obtained it by crying "Peace, peace," but they give no peace. They made their rickety scaffolds of reconstruction. The South ventured on them. Radicalism has already, by fraud and force, tried to hack them down. The South is to have no peace until it lays itself at the feet of radical spoliation and annoyance, and forgets all of its manhood in its abject obeisance to the social Mumbo Jumbo. Unless it does so, the whole country is to be racked with the suspension of *habeas corpus* and the threats of civil war. In fine, and under specious pretexts, the war is to be renewed for ulterior purposes. What those purposes are, time will determine. What such bills as this mean the people of New York, who are, every election, blessed with Federal supervisors and their paid minions, know full well. It is my purpose now to enter my earnest protest as well against the swash and swagger of the military and its insolent domination over civil rights and interests, as against the espionage of paid Federal supervisors over all our elections. It was to be hoped that such discussions as this were long since over: but, sir, the question recurs:

IS THE MILITARY SUPERIOR TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITY?

One of the peculiarities of these times is that the conservators of the established order in this country are compelled to discuss and discuss again the fundamental questions, long since the foregone conclusions of our best men. We have to go to the alphabet of freedom. In 1840 the whig party denounced Poinsett's scheme of a standing army, which, compared to our present armies, was as the mole-hill to the mountain. But no one objects to this jealousy of military power unless he be a despot or his tool. This jealousy of the supremacy of the military over the civil authorities took form in our constitutions. It springs from the training of the Anglo-Saxon mind for a thousand years. A distinct military order was always regarded by our ancestors as dangerous in a land of liberty. When, therefore, we are to have again scattered over the States where war does not exist hundreds of shoulder-straps and thousands of soldiers, in camp, in barracks, in hotels, what will follow? It is easy to see that under this bill we shall have again those army sheriffs, the provosts. They will again sneak into our assemblages to carry on an espionage for those in power. We are to have in every congressional district extra constitutional commissioners or supervisors. Again civilians are to be dragged from quiet homes by soldiery to be tried by drum-head rules. In such a prospect, let us go back to the origin of civil liberty and reproduce the rudiments.

It is laid down by certain writers that in absolute monarchies the safety of the prince requires a great military establishment. This is required on the principle of fear. Monarchs govern more by fear than love. This seems to be the doctrine of the present Administration. In England, when it was necessary to raise a force in time of war, the leaders were elected by the people, to make them responsible

to those whom if they injured they could account unto for their misdoings. Blackstone says, (book 1, chapter 13:)

Because of their great power these officers were elected by the people in their full assembly or folk-mote, in the same manner as sheriffs were elected; following still that old fundamental maxim of the Saxon constitution, that where any officer was intrusted with such power as if abused might tend to the oppression of the people, that power was delegated by a vote of the people themselves.

This custom was inherited from the Germans. Out of this custom sprang the militia, the citizen soldiery, a system by which the discipline was made general and easy and the soldier mingled freely with the people. It is this conservative element by which the spirit of the people was communicated to the soldier and foreign and standing armies were rendered useless and innoxious. We want no soldiery in our States except that which is of the States. The second amendment of the Constitution took care to guard the States and their militia:

A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a State, the right of THE PEOPLE to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

The first article, eighth section, in enumerating the powers of Congress to call out the militia, expressly "reserves to the States the appointment of the officers."

MILITARY COMMISSIONS—ENGLISH PRECEDENTS.

Springing out of this old jealousy of military authority was the distrust of military commissions, like those which will assuredly follow the suspension of civil process and the suspension of *habeas corpus*. Blackstone calls all such elements of power "temporary excrescences bred out of the distemper of the State." This Administration and its servitors have sought in vain for pretexts to declare martial law, which, as Sir Matthew Hale said, was built upon no settled principles, but is entirely arbitrary in its decisions—in truth and reality, no law. The only justification for such a state of things is for discipline in the Army. It has no place in a community where courts remain and the civil law stands. Military commissions are the detestable fungus of a bad condition. The English people suffered from such creatures of despotism. The famous "petition of right," a part of the bible of English freedom, enacted that "no commission shall issue to proceed within this land according to martial law." They had felt the outrage of trying men other than by the law of the land and by a jury; and they even struck their kings down to break this infamous tyranny of the military. What is it but an unlimited power to create crimes and annex to them any punishments? It is legislation. It makes the executive the legislature. It makes a part the whole. The President is a part of the Legislature. He approves and vetoes laws; he cannot make laws nor suspend laws. One of the chief crimes of this Administration is that it has undertaken to do, nay has done, what the kings of England undertook to do—to suspend laws.

SUSPENSION OF THE LAW OF LIBERTY.

Allow me to cull some examples from English history for our guidance. History is written for our instruction, and it but repeats itself.

In England the laws of Parliament, unlike the laws of Congress, are paramount. Here the Constitution is the supreme law of the land; and any law made by Congress or State inconsistent with the Constitution is void. In England it is otherwise. If the President

of the United States undertakes to legislate he usurps: if he undertakes, as he did in Louisiana, to suspend any part of the Constitution, from which he derives all his authority either as President or as Commander-in-Chief, he does just what James II did, and for which he lost his crown. The revolution of 1688 was grounded on the breach of the English constitution by the attempt of the monarch to suspend certain laws concerning religion. These laws of Parliament as to the English Church were intolerant, bad laws, and James sought to suspend them. On the 4th of May, 1688, he proclaimed that it was his "royal will and pleasure that from henceforth the execution of all and all manner of penal laws in matters ecclesiastical * * * is hereby suspended."

He ordered the bishops of the realm to have his proclamation read in all the churches. Seven bishops objected and protested—

That the declaration is founded upon such a *dispensing power* as hath often been declared illegal in Parliament and particularly in 1662 and 1672 and the beginning of your Majesty's reign, and is a matter of so great moment and consequence to the whole nation, both in church and state, that your petitioners cannot in prudence, honor, or conscience so far make themselves party to it as the distribution of it over all the nation.

For writing these noble words the bishops were imprisoned in the Tower. On the 29th of June, 1688, they were tried. I hold in my hand the volume of State Trials of Howell containing this most remarkable trial.

It might be well before stating further the results of the great trial to ask: Where will this authorized suspension of *habeas corpus* end, Mr. Speaker? The right to criticise and protest against the arbitrary suspension of this writ may itself be regarded as a crime. The lawyers of the bishops, Sir Robert Sawyer, "old Pollfexen," Pemberton, and others, placed their defense upon the fact that no English potentate had the right to suspend the law. No more moral right has the Executive or Congress to suspend *habeas corpus*, to override the militia of the States by Gatling guns or Sheridan's orders, to abridge free speech, free press, right of trial by indictment and jury, or to establish military commissions and inflict unusual punishment. If there were no dispensing power in the King, there was no seditious libel in the bishops. If a southern man tells the truth as to the tyranny of this Administration, he has been guilty of no crime. As Justice Powell said to the jury in the case of the bishops:

If the King can dispense, it amounts to an abrogation and repeal of all laws. If this be once allowed, there will be no need of Parliament; all the legislation will be in the King, which is a thing worth considering, and I leave the issue to God and your consciences.

The jury came into court on the 30th of June and found the bishops not guilty; whereat, says the report, "there were great shouts in court and throughout Westminster Hall." The shouting was regarded by Judge Jeffries, of infamous immortality, as indecent. Such shouting has not yet died away. The echoes of that shouting hailed William of Orange as the new King; and the same echoes are going on now and here, proclaiming, in answer to last fall's verdict of the free people of America, that there is to-day no cause or pretext to suspend our fundamental law, but that the Constitution "as it is" shall be regarded.

INDICTMENT OF HISTORY—EXCESS OF POWER.

Mr. Speaker, these lessons of history as to the abrogation of fundamental law and the establishment of military codes will be unheeded by this Congress, but not by the American people. This bill will

pass this House. It simply overloads our statutes with what Burke called an exuberance of mischief, unknown even to despotism. This side of the House, aided by some thirty gentlemen opposite, have done all they could to avert the great evil. For this, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] has arraigned these republican lovers of liberty, with merciless irony. He charged them with taking their luxurious ease, while he and his band here struggled to fix upon the statute book this monstrous law of intermeddling and coercion. I trust gentlemen are not to be deterred, by such an attack, from their whole duty to the end! If this bill becomes a law, what is the dire consequence? It will bring only a disorderly tyranny. The history of reconstruction, with its penalties and force, its frauds and spites, has been dark enough. It has been a tissue of folly, tumult, ruin, violence, and usurpation. It is a history "of eternal conspiracies worse than that of Greece." It does not banish Themistocles, but it banishes honesty. It does not starve Aristides, but it starves whole populations. It does not force Miltiades into exile or poison Socrates, but it does worse, it destroys States, and it exiles the people. "All the violence and wickedness by which a beginning power must acquire strength and all the weakness by which falling States are brought to complete destruction," are inaugurated in such measures as this.

If I might change somewhat a paragraph in a recent article from an English statesman and apply it to this measure, I would say: "The magistrate, after sacrificing order, peace, union—all the interests which it is his first duty to protect—for the alleged purpose of promoting liberty and justice, will be forced, after experience, to admit that he has really been promoting tyranny and wrong." The sonnder the doctrines of such a magistrate the stronger are the arguments against the policy which deprives a good cause of its natural advantages.

WHERE IS THE RELIEF?

Mr. Speaker, history, economy, philosophy—in fine, all results from the experiences of mankind point to the fatal effects of such measures of force as this bill, while they point to the beneficent consequences of the policy of conciliation. Where and when are these direful consequences to cease? When and where are we to sound the glad tidings of individual brotherhood and State equality? Were our elections indeed a failure? Do we who oppose this bill not represent the moral though not the numerical majority of this House and in the grand total the voice and conscience of the people?

What relief, then, is there for the stricken South? Is it only in the appeal which one of old made in his great distress and so apposite to this time?

I would seek unto God, and unto God would I commit my cause: which doeth great things and unsearchable; marvelous things without number: He disappointeth the devices of the crafty, so that their hands cannot perform their enterprise. He taketh the wise in their own craftiness: and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong.—*Job*, v: 8, 9, 12, 13.

But how long, O, how long, are we to wait for this divine relief, and for the undoing of the crafty and froward? The voice of the people last fall remains unheeded. Radicalism still moves on here under the guise of legislation. She flaunts her black banner in our faces. She glories in her triumphs over the prosperity and happiness of our beautiful sunny South. The verses of one of our native poets

fitly, though quaintly, describes the desolation which has followed her path:

A WASTED LAND.

She came, and with her hand,
With her mouth, yea, and her eyes,
She hath ravaged all the land;
Its beauty shall no more rise:
She hath drawn the wine to her lip
For a mere wanton sip;
Lo, where the vine branch lies;
Lo, where the drained grapes drip.

Her feet left many a stain;
And her lips left many a sting,
She will never come again,
And the fruit of everything
Is a canker or a pain:
And a memory doth crouch
Like an asp—yea, in each part
Where she hath left her touch—
Lying in wait for the heart.

[Joaquin Miller.

But the time is at hand when her career will be ended and the ravages of the spoiler shall cease. The wantonness of power is nearly over. The canker and pain, they too will soon cease. Patience, and moderation—moderation, *moderation* above all. Be true to these, gentlemen of the South, and before the gray dawn of the morning which ushers in the hundred years of our independence shall have passed, the States, all in unison and self-respecting and respected, will make according harmony.

CONCLUSION.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, it is the saddest of my reflections that the real remedy for these southern troubles, dangers, uncertainties—the one mode which you did not and do not employ was yet so simple, so obvious, so easy! The small humanity of concession, the cheap generosity of conciliation, would have accomplished all that your repressions and coercions have so signally failed to accomplish. There was discontent at the South, but it would have vanished before a policy of kindness such as you might honorably have adopted; or, if you could not be kind, if you had only let these stricken and brave people alone—severely, nay, even contemptuously alone! What was it that blotted out of existence the non-jurors who had kept England uneasy with their intrigues and rebellions for five convulsive reigns? It was not repressive legislation, for that was the pabulum and the inspiration of their existence. It was not persecution, for it was that upon which they chiefly thrived. It was the cessation of persecution. It was the abandonment of pursuit. It was the complete, definite, final ignoring of restrictive laws, and the extension of amnesty so absolute as to be actually contemptuous that made voiceless these ancient and experienced trumpets of sedition. They had successfully held up against all the power of the Parliament and the Throne. They could not contend, they perished as suddenly as *ephemera* before the gentle yet withering zephyrs of contempt and silence! How long would these misguided southern youth have been likely to keep up their childish Ku Klux masquerade, with its stupid ceremonial, its clumsy garb, and its night walking, but for the incentive of your frowns and the battery of your restrictions?

One word more, sir, and I have done. We are not here any longer to ask, as we have so often done, for charity, for liberality, for mercy

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 925 5

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 925 5